



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,312	08/24/2006	Marck Michalewicz	035777-0105	2668
22428 7590 06/22/2010 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
SAYADIAN, HIRAYR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2814				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/22/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/554,312		MICHALEWICZ ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	HRAYR A. SAYADIAN		2814	

All Participants:

(1) HRAYR A. SAYADIAN.

(2) Feng Ma.

Date of Interview: 6/17/2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112(1)

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

AR submitted that [0038] of the PGPUB provides support to claims 24 and 25. Examiner requested AR to point to a portion within the cited paragraph that provides actual or inherent support. AR responded that one of ordinary skill would understand the scope of the claims based on the paragraph. E noted that the law required actual or inherent support, but being obvious would not provide 112(1) support. Agreement was not reached. E also noted the prevalent prior art directed to nano-tunneling based detection and suggested AR call E before the filing of an amendment with a proposed claim so E can help advance prosecution of this application.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/HRAYR A SAYADIAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 2814

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)